



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,740	10/17/2003	Sylvie Camus	324-160	8299
22429	7590	11/30/2006		
LOWE HAUPTMAN BERNER, LLP 1700 DIAGONAL ROAD SUITE 300 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
			EXAMINER OLATUNJI, OLATUNDE O	
			ART UNIT 2135	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/686,740	Applicant(s) CAMUS ET AL.	
	Examiner Olatunde Olatunji	Art Unit 2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/17/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/17/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim(s) 1-9 have been presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 10/17/2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox et al., United States PG Pub. 2002/0069174 in view of Geer, Jr. et al., United States Patent No. 6,490,358

With respect to claim 1, Fox reference discloses:

in delegate terminal (see Fig. 7, element 144, Delegate), drawing up a recertification request (see Fig. 7, element 143; ¶ [0148], Request) and transmitting said

Art Unit: 2135

recertification request to said titleholder terminal (see Fig. 7, element 140, "delegate sends a digitally signed request to client for GDC (Gump Delegation Certificate)"),

in said titleholder terminal (see Fig. 7, element 110, Client), drawing up a second electronic delegate certificate (see Fig. 7, element 147; page 12 ¶ [0146] & ¶ [0148], GDC) in response to said recertification request (see Fig. 7, Request step 140' then Issue step 142') and transmitting said second certificate to said delegate terminal (see Fig. 7; ¶ [0148], "GDC, ... is sent from the client to delegate"), said second certificate including data such as said public key of said titleholder (see Fig. 7, element 121; ¶ [0148], "Client public key"), said public key of said delegate (see ¶ [0148], "delegate public key") and a delegation attribute (see ¶ [0148], "OTS (One Time Secret)"), and a signature of said data with a private key of said titleholder (see ¶ [0148], "a GDC which is digitally signed by client"), and

Fox references doesn't teach:

in said delegate terminal, validating said signature in said second delegate certificate transmitted in order for said delegate terminal to use said second certificate for any action delegated by said titleholder to said delegate.

Geer reference teaches:

in said delegate terminal (see Fig. 1, authorized computer), validating said signature in said second delegate certificate (see col. 4, lines 4-6; "verifies the signature on the authorization certificate") transmitted in order for said delegate terminal to use said second certificate for any action delegated by said titleholder (see Fig. 1, authorizing computer) to said delegate (see col. 4, lines 4-12; "proof that the

Art Unit: 2135

authorization computer is authorized to perform the action specified in the authorization certificate”).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to have modified Fox invention to include Geer’s step of validating the signature in the delegate certificate at the delegate terminal to prove that the authorized computer generates authorization certificate (see Geer col. 4, lines 7-8).

With respect to claim 2, Geer reference teaches wherein said data in said second delegate certificate (see col. 3, lines 55-58; authorization certificate) includes a delegation duration (see col. 6, lines 23-28; “lifetime of the authorization”).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to have modified Fox invention to include Geer’s delegation duration in the certificate for the purpose of revocation (see Geer col. 6, lines 23-29).

With respect to claim 3, Geer reference teaches wherein said data in said second delegate certificate (see col. 3, lines 55-58; authorization certificate) includes information relating to revocation of said second certificate (see col. 6, lines 23-28; “revocation can be accomplished simply by notifying the recipient of the authorization certificate or by waiting for the lifetime of the authorization as specified in the authorization certificate to expire”).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to have modified Fox invention to include Geer's information relating to revocation in the certificate for the purpose of revocation (see Geer col. 6, lines 23-29).

With respect to claim 4, Geer reference teaches wherein said titleholder certificate (see col. 3, lines 33-40, identification certificate) is included in said data of said second delegate certificate (see Fig. 2A, element 27; col. 3, lines 33-40, *authorizing computer sends identification certificate to the authorized computer*).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to have modified Fox invention to include Geer's identification certificate in the data of the delegate certificate for the purpose for the authorized computer to verify the authenticity of the authorizing computer (see col. 3, lines 18-22).

With respect to claim 5, Fox reference teaches wherein an attribute representing authorization of said titleholder (see page 2, ¶ [0010], OTS) to delegate is included in said titleholder certificate (see page 12, ¶ [0148], Issue step).

With respect to claim 6, Fox and Geer combination teaches including determination of a signature of said public key of said delegate (see Geer col. 3, lines 15-23; *identification signed by private key*) in said delegate terminal (see Geer col. 3,

line 24; authorized computer) as a function of a private key of said delegate (see Geer col. 3, lines 18-23), said delegate public key and said signature being introduced into said recertification request (see Fox Fig. 7, element 143; ¶ [0148], Request), and validation of said signature extracted from the received recertification request as a function of said delegate public key by said titleholder terminal (see Geer col. 3, lines 37-39; *verifies the authenticity of the signature*), before drawing up said second delegate certificate.

With respect to claim 8, Fox and Geer combination teaches including generation of said private key of said titleholder in said titleholder terminal (see Geer col. 3, lines 58-60; *newly minted public key pair created*), in place of drawing up and transmitting said recertification request (see Fox Fig. 7, element 143; ¶ [0148], Request), in order to establish said signature of said data by means of said private key and transmit said private key of said titleholder substantially in parallel with said electronic second delegate certificate to said delegate terminal (see Geer col. 4 lines 2-4; *sends private key encrypted with authorization certificate to authorized computer*).

With respect to claim 9, Geer reference teaches wherein said second delegate certificate (see col. 3, lines 55-58; authorization certificate) is stored on a storage medium removable from said delegate terminal (see col. 5, lines 24-29 & 41-51; smart cards).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to have modified Fox invention to include Geer's use of a smart card for the purpose of confer membership privileges to other smart card owners (see col. 5, lines 26-29).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox et al., United States PG Pub. 2002/0069174 in view of Geer, Jr. et al., United States Patent No. 6,490,358 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sudia et al., U.S. PG Pub 2002/0029337

With respect to claim 7, Fox and Geer combination doesn't teach generation of second delegate public and private keys in said delegate terminal. Sudia reference teaches including generation of second delegate public and private keys in said delegate terminal (see page 8, ¶ [0099], "delegate to create a new key pair"). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to have included the generation of second delegate public and private keys for purpose to eliminate any potential confusion between use of the delegate's private key on behalf of the titleholder and the titleholder's private key (see page 8, ¶ [0099]).

This combination would result in the second public key (see Sudia page 8, ¶ [0099], *new public key included in the power of attorney certificate*) being included in said recertification request (see Fox Fig. 7, element 143; ¶ [0148], Request) and then

Art Unit: 2135

introduced into said delegate second certificate (see Fig. 7, element 147; page 12 ¶ [0146] & ¶ [0148], GDC) by said titleholder terminal in place of said respective public key of said delegate.

Prior Art Made of Record

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and patent applications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to delegation by electronic certificate, such as:

United States Patent No. 6,490,358 to Geer, Jr. et al., is cited to show enabling business transactions in computer networks.

United States P.G. Pub. No. 2003/0070070 to Yeager et al., is cited to show trust spectrum for certificate distribution in distributed Peer-to-Peer networks.

United States P.G. Pub. No. 2002/0013898 to Sudia et al., is cited to show a method and apparatus for roaming use of cryptographic values.

United States P.G. Pub. No. 2003/0033528 to Ozog et al., is cited to show a system and method for specifying security, privacy, and access control to information used by others.

Conclusion

All claims are rejected.


Art Unit: 2135

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olatunde Olatunji whose telephone number is (571) 270-1020. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TR 7:30-5pm EST & 2nd Friday 7:30-4pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Olatunde Olatunji
11/20/2006



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100